



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/085,310	02/28/2002	Sherridythe A. Fraser	035451-0185 (3731.Palm)	7608
26371	7590	06/01/2004	EXAMINER	
FOLEY & LARDNER 777 EAST WISCONSIN AVENUE SUITE 3800 MILWAUKEE, WI 53202-5308			ABDULSELAM, ABBAS I	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2674	6

DATE MAILED: 06/01/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/085,310

Applicant(s)

FRASER ET AL

Examiner

Abbas I Abdulsalam

Art Unit

2674

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 March 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 03/15/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Meyerson et al. (USPN 5579487) does not teach a handheld computing device. Applicant also argues that Meyerson does not teach the particular properties of the display unit being provided by the display unit to the processor. In addition, applicant argues that Meyerson does not teach a wireless communication interface between the detachable visual display unit and the processing unit. Furthermore, applicant argues that Meyerson does not teach a display that is flexible and also expandable. However as shown on the art rejection below, Meyerson describes a configurable electronic work slate unit as being selectively integrated in a compact and highly ergonomic structure, an example of which include an RF communication module. See col. 2, lines 52-56, col. 3, lines 39-45 and abstract. One of ordinary skill in the art would have ascertained that a compact structure could be small enough to be a handheld device. In addition one can refer cases, (Re Rose 105 USPQ 237 (ccpa 1950)) & (Re Japikse 86 USPQ 70 (ccpa 1950)), a scenario, where size and shape is of no importance. Meyerson teaches a processor element (CPU) of the slate unit to identify the particular type of each removable module, with suitable codes being stored in the removable modules and sheet units (col. 11, lines 36-38). Moreover, Meyerson teaches a display (64a) in the form of removable sheet unit as shown on Fig. 8(a), and discloses the slate unit including a stored programming suitable for supporting operation of a plurality of types of removable modules (col. 11 lines 53-56). It would have been obvious to utilize Meyerson programming and the codes

Art Unit: 2674

associated with sheet units in order to obtain the desired "properties of the display unit".

Meyerson teaches a removable display (64a) and a processor (66a) each incorporating a standardized sheet interface included within a shell unit (68a). See col. 10, lines 60-65, Fig. 10(a-b). Meyerson mentions the use of display of various types (col. 15, lines 23-24), and it is also well known to utilize various attributes of a display device including its flexibility and expandability

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meyerson et al. (USPN 5579487).

Regarding claims 1, 15, 22, and 26, Meyerson teaches a configurable electronic work slate unit with a changeable complement of removable modules. As shown in Fig. 8, Meyerson illustrates a front view showing frontal display (64a) within shell unit (68a) (Fig. 8a), and discloses that the display (64a) is planar and is in the form of removable sheet unit. See col. 9, lines 57-67, col. 10, lines 6-7 and Fig. 8. Meyerson teaches that the removable display (64a), a processor/memory (66a) and the power units (67) each incorporate a standardized sheet interface (203) configured to cooperate with any one of the standardized frame interfaces (196) included within shell unit (68a). See col. 10, lines 60-65, col. 11, lines 15-20 and Fig. 11. Meyerson

Art Unit: 2674

discloses connectors functioning as interfaces (198, 204) can provide signal-coupling paths including data port and control port paths. See col. 11, lines 39-45. Moreover, Meyerson teaches that each standardized interface is arranged to provide at least one signal-coupling path, which is usable to enable the processor element (CPU) of the slate unit to identify the particular type of each removable module. See col. 11, lines 29-45. Meyerson teaches that the processor/memory unit (66a) is enabled using known networking and control techniques to communicate with the display unit (64a). See col. 11, lines 47-53. Furthermore, Meyerson teaches that each removable module also includes some provision for enabling its type to be identified using codes or other identifiers. See col. 14, lines 54-65. Meyerson does not specifically teach a “first communication interface” and a “second communication interface” However as mentioned above Meyerson does teach standardized sheet interface (203) cooperating with any of the frame interface (196) as shown in Fig. 11.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize Meyerson’s interfacing for the purpose of communicating among the components within the electronic work slate unit. One would have been motivated in view of Meyerson that the interfacing as configured in Fig. 11 can be equivalently used to meet the desired first and second communication interfaces.

Additionally, in regard claims 15, 22 and 26, as mentioned above, Meyerson teaches that the processor/memory unit (66a) is enabled using known networking and control techniques to communicate with the display unit (64a). Furthermore, Meyerson teaches that each removable module also includes some provision for enabling its type to be identified using codes or other

Art Unit: 2674

identifiers. See col. 14, lines 54-65. It would have been obvious that that communication between the processor and the display unit can be indicative of the properties of the display unit.

Regarding claim 2, Meyerson teaches that electrical coupling is suitably provided by various connections including optical, radio, capacitive or other coupling arrangements. See col. 10, lines 17-20. Meyerson also teaches the use of removable module with respect to elements of the electronic unit to enable communication with the module by the use of appropriate protocol. See col. 14, lines 63-67.

Regarding claims 3, 6-7 and 24, Meyerson teaches the use of a display (50) system including the liquid crystal technology. See col. 6, lines 33-35. See Fig. 1 (50).

Regarding claims 4-5, Meyerson teaches the use of frontal display (64a) and is in the form of removable sheet. See col. 10, lines 4-7.

Regarding claims 8-14, 23, and 25 Meyerson teaches the use of interfaces to one or more standard removable models including displays of various types. See col. 15, lines 22-28.

Regarding claims 16, 19 and 27-28, Meyerson teaches that the processor/memory unit (66a) is enabled using known networking and control techniques to communicate with the display unit (64a). See col. 11, lines 47-53.

Regarding claims 17-18, Meyerson teaches that each removable module also includes some provision for enabling its type to be identified using codes or other identifiers. See col. 14, lines 54-65.

Regarding claim 20, Meyerson teaches an antenna module (146) providing a communication when radio transceiver (134) is utilized. See Fig. 6 (134).

Art Unit: 2674

Regarding claim 21, Meyerson teaches an antenna module (146) providing a communication when WAN transceiver (136) is utilized. See Fig. 6 (136).

Regarding claim 29, Meyerson discloses that the display (64a) is planar and is in the form of removable sheet unit. See col. 10, lines 6-7 and Fig. 8.

Conclusion

3. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to **Abbas Abduselam** whose telephone number is **(703) 305-8591**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday (9:00-5:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Richard Hjerpe**, can be reached at **(703) 305-4709**.

Art Unit: 2674

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314

Hand delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology center 2600 customer Service office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Abbas Abdulsalam

Examiner

Art Unit 2674

05/24/04


XIAO WU
PRIMARY EXAMINER